

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are presently pending, of which Claims 13-15, 19-26, and 34 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 35 and 36 have been added herein. Support for these newly added claims is found at least on page 4, lines 13-22 and FIGS. 1 and 2 of the originally filed application. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shinohara *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,851,062).

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over Shinohara *et al.* Support for the amendment is found at least at page 4, lines 13-22 and FIGS. 1 and 2 of the originally filed application. No new matter has been added.

More particularly, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the prism array includes peaks and valleys and that substantially all of the peaks are disposed in about a single plane. In contrast, the prism array in Shinohara *et al.* that alternates orientation includes peaks that are not in about the same plane. See, for example, FIGS. 11, 12(a), and 12(b) of Shinohara *et al.*

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 3, 11, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinohara *et al.*

Each of these claims depends directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1, which has been amended to recite patentable subject matter over Shinohara *et al.* Accordingly, the rejection is believed to be overcome.

The Examiner rejected Claims 27, 30, and 31 as being unpatentable over Shinohara *et al.*

Independent Claims 27 and 30 have been amended similar to Claim 1, *i.e.*, to recite that the prism array includes peaks and valleys with substantially all of the peaks being disposed in about a single plane.

As set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that Shinohara *et al.* do not teach this limitation. Claim 30 depends directly from Claim 27 and this includes the patentable distinction. Accordingly, it is believed that this rejection has been overcome.

The Examiner stated that Claims 5-9, 28, 29, 32, and 33 were objected to "as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."


The Examiner is thanked for such allowance. It is respectfully submitted that each of these claims depends from an otherwise allowable claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
Erik L. Ence
Registration No. 42,511
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Dated: February 3, 2004
Concord, Massachusetts 01742-9133